

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of

Applicants : Victor A. Raul et al.
Serial No. : 10/576,991
Filed : March 6, 2007
Title : **CONTROLLED-RELEASE COMPOSITION FOR TOPICAL APPLICATION AND A METHOD OF DELIVERING AN ACTIVE AGENT TO A SUBSTRATE**
Docket : DOC 0170 PA (40218.354)
Art Unit : 1627
Examiner : S. Pihonak
Confirm. No. : 5824

EFS Web Electronic Submission

September 8, 2010

MAIL STOP PRE-APPEAL

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Applicants request review of the final rejection mailed May 10, 2010, in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this Request. This Request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal and a Request for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to the final rejection. Review is requested for the reasons stated below.

The present status of claims is: claims 1-41 are pending. Of these, claims 8, 13, and 18-41 stand withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-7, 9-12, and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Kosal, U.S. Patent No. 6,545,086 in view of Gray et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,040,307, and further in view of Ulrich, U.S. Patent No. 6,365,146. Applicants filed a Response to Office Action (Final Rejection) on July 6, 2010. In the Advisory Action mailed July 27, 2010, the Examiner entered the Response, but maintained the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-12, and 14-18.

Applicants submit that the rejection is not well taken in that: clear errors of fact have been made; and clear deficiencies in the references omit one or more essential elements of the claimed invention needed to establish a *prima facie* case. Applicants will discuss each deficiency in the rejection in turn.

Errors of Fact and Law

In the Final Rejection, pages 2-3, the Examiner asserted that,

Kosal teaches a volatile silicon [sic, silicone] fluid; while it is acknowledged that some silicone fluids are lipophilic, there are others that are non-lipophilic. Kosal broadly teaches the presence of a silicone fluid; therefore, as there are silicone fluids which are non-lipophilic, Kosal still renders the claimed invention obvious, as Kosal teaches the claimed oil-in-water emulsion comprised [of] the elected silicone component, a surfactant, and water.

Initially, the Examiner has failed to establish a factual basis for her assertion that there are volatile silicone fluids that are non-lipophilic. The volatile silicone fluids of Kosal are certainly lipophilic. See, col. 3, lines 44-55, (the volatile silicone fluids are liquids); col. 3, lines 60-65 and Examples, esp. Examples 2-4 at col. 6, lines 58-62 (the volatile silicone fluids dilute/dissolve/solvate the silicone PSA's); and col. 4, lines 24-28 (the volatile silicone fluids, blended with the silicone PSA's form the oil phase of the emulsion). Kosal provides no examples of volatile silicone liquids which are non-lipophilic, and neither has the Examiner. Kosal excludes only *non-silicone* lipophilic solvents (see, col. 3, lines 60-65), not all lipophilic solvents. To the contrary, Kosal teaches the necessity of using the volatile silicone liquids when forming the emulsion. These factual deficiencies undermines the basis of the rejection.

The Examiner also erred as a matter of logic, as Kosal does not "broadly" teach the presence of volatile silicone fluids that can be either lipophilic or non-lipophilic. All of the volatile silicone fluids taught by Kosal are lipophilic and must be lipophilic as they function to dissolve/solvate the silicone PSA component of the emulsion. There is absolutely no teaching in Kosal that there is such a thing as a non-lipophilic volatile silicone fluid, let alone that such a compound could be substituted for the lipophilic silicone fluids used therein. As the disperse silicone phase of Kosal is the oil phase of the emulsion, one would not (and probably could not) use a non-lipophilic solvent in the oil phase to dissolve/solvate the silicone PSA's. This error in logic also undermines the factual basis of the rejection.

As previously argued, Kosal's *silence* concerning non-lipophilic solvents also cannot form the factual basis to support a conclusion of obviousness. *In re Burt*, 148 USPQ 548, 553

(CCPA 1966) ("Silence in a reference is hardly a proper substitute for an adequate disclosure of facts from which a conclusion of obviousness may justifiably follow.")

Finally, the Examiner's legal conclusion that Kosal "teaches" the claimed oil-in-water emulsion is flawed in that the oil phase contains the volatile silicone fluid which was used to dissolve/solvate the silicone PSA. The Examiner's implication that Kosal's pressure sensitive silicone adhesive and volatile silicone liquid together make up the recited "silicone component," still ignores that fact that the volatile silicone liquid is necessary to form the emulsion and that its presence means that Kosal's emulsion is *not* "substantially free of lipophilic solvent" as claimed. Kosal's oil-in-water emulsion does contain a lipophilic solvent -- namely, the volatile silicone fluid. Thus, Kosal does not "teach" the claimed composition.

Clear deficiencies in the references omit one or more essential elements of the claimed invention needed to establish a prima facie case.

Gray and Ulrich are applied in the rejection for only limited purposes. Gray is alleged to teach the topical administration of a fungicide active agent, and Ulrich is alleged to teach that surfactants "are commonly used for drug delivery." Neither Gray nor Ulrich teach or suggest an oil-in-water emulsion that is substantially free of lipophilic solvents as claimed. Thus, the secondary references do not aid the Examiner in establishing this necessary factual support for the rejection. As discussed in detail above, Kosal also does not teach or suggest this recited element of the claims. Accordingly, as there are clear deficiencies in all of the applied references as they fail to teach a recited claim element, the rejection is not factually supported and no prima facie case for obviousness has been established.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the rejection is not well taken, is based on factual and/or legal errors and omissions, and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP

By /Timothy W. Hagan/
Timothy W. Hagan
Registration No. 29,001

One Dayton Centre
One South Main Street, Suite 1300
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023
(937) 449-6400
Facsimile: (937) 449-6405
E-mail: tim.hagan@dinslaw.com
TWH/

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) DOC 0170 PA/40218.354
<p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]</p> <p>on September 8, 2010</p> <p>Signature /Timothy W. Hagan/</p> <p>Typed or printed name Timothy W. Hagan</p>		<p>Application Number 10/576,991</p> <p>Filed March 6, 2007</p> <p>First Named Inventor Victor A. Raul, et al.</p> <p>Art Unit 1627</p> <p>Examiner S. Pihonak</p>

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

- applicant/inventor.
- assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)
- attorney or agent of record.
Registration number 29,001
- attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____

/Timothy W. Hagan/

Signature

Timothy W. Hagan

Typed or printed name

937-449-6400

Telephone number

September 8, 2010

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

*Total of 1 forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.